

Next point—and last point. At this point, the next finding ought to be no surprise from the inspector general. The Office of Net Assessment did not administer contracts in accordance with the Federal Defense Department and Washington Headquarters Services internal regulations and policies.

Further, the audit states the “[Office of Net Assessment] acquisition personnel cannot verify whether they received services, valued at \$4.1 million, in accordance with the statement of work.”

Now, let's return back to that first quote I gave you from the Director of Net Assessment.

We review all deliverables to ensure [that] they're consistent with the statement of work. We evaluate each deliverable to assess whether we should seek additional information or require a resubmission of commissioned work.

Based upon all of the available evidence from these 20 contracts that were inspected by the inspector general—and that is not all the contracts that the office negotiated—this Director's statement is absolutely false.

So here is the bottom line: The Office of Net Assessment has no clue what they are paying for and whether they even received a complete work product. And whatever they are actually doing, it is not in compliance with Federal regulations, policy, and law.

This is a complete embarrassment and a slap in the face of American taxpayers. While the Office of Net Assessment wasted millions of dollars in taxpayer money every year, the communist Chinese Government developed hypersonic missiles that can travel the globe.

If this unit isn't doing the job that they are supposed to, to assess our national security capabilities and the capabilities of our enemies, why are we still funding it? It would be better to take the \$20 million budget and give it to our servicemembers. At least we know that those servicemembers have earned it.

A government slush fund will always be a government slush fund unless Congress, with our power of oversight and appropriations, steps up and fixes the problem. So I encourage my colleagues, especially those on the Senate Armed Services Committee, to take a stand against this blatant waste, fraud, abuse, and gross mismanagement.

#### FREE SPEECH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, on another subject, I have come to this floor several times in recent months—maybe over the course of a couple of years—on my concerns about free speech on campus. There has been a lot said in opposition to reports of crack-down on speech on campuses, but today I come to the floor to give one shining example of a university upholding expressions of free speech and making it still happen.

This all started with former University of Chicago President Robert Zim-

mer. The institution, starting with him and continuing, has consistently pushed back on the trends of safe spaces, trigger warnings, and the cancellation of invited speakers.

Instead, in a letter to all incoming freshmen, the University of Chicago lays out its philosophy in plain English. In the letter to the 2020 freshman class, it said that one of the university's “defining characteristics is our commitment to freedom of inquiry and expression.”

Now, this is more than just words; the university has consistently followed through on this policy. Even today, the university is still open to dissenting points of view. It even goes so far as to tell freshmen “at times this may challenge you and even cause discomfort.”

They are absolutely right. The point of college is not to be coddled. The point of college or university is to learn. How can students do that if they don't step out of their comfort zone?

I often say that my definition of a university is a place where controversy should run rampant. At the University of Chicago, that means noting that “diversity of opinion and background is a fundamental strength of our community.”

Both opinion and background are very important, and it defeats the point to just have the one. Our universities cannot just have just a veneer of diversity; the whole point of bringing in students of different backgrounds is to get different points of view. That aim is meaningless if all students who go to the college believe the same things.

I have introduced several bills to provide transparency for prospective students. My bills focus on transparency of cost, but in many ways openness about a university's values are just as important.

So I congratulate former President Zimmer, who is doing just that and putting his university's values on his sleeve. If some schools keep cracking down on free speech and invited speakers, then the free market will send their students elsewhere. That is because I don't think all kids want to go to a school where they will never be challenged and where their ideals will always be reaffirmed.

I am happy to see projects like the University of Austin, a newly founded college dedicated to free speech principles.

So, in conclusion, it takes time to start new institutions. Instead, we need people to stand up in the colleges that we already have. And I hope others will join me in doing just that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas R. Bush, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 498, Douglas R. Bush, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard J. Durbin, Jacky Rosen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 362.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Homer L. Wilkes, of Mississippi, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.